

REMARKS

The Office Action dated June 26, 2008 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1-6 and 8-15 are currently pending, including independent claims 1, 8, 9, 14 and 15. Specifically, Applicants here amend claims 1-6 and 8-10, cancel claim 7, and add new claims 11-15 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully urge that the claim amendments and additions add no new matter to the present application, and therefore should be entered. Each and every grounds for rejections and objections are addressed below. Reconsiderations and allowance of claims 1-6 and 8-15 are therefore respectfully requested in view of the claim amendments and the following comments.

Allowable Claims

Applicants wish to express great appreciation for the indication given in the Office Action that claims 2, 3, and 7 are allowable if amended into independent form and to address the formality objections and rejections, as described below.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the

Applicants regard as the invention, primarily due to antecedent basis concerns. Applicants here amended claims 1-3 to clarify the claims and to address each of the concerns raised in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants urge that this rejection is now moot and should be withdrawn. Reconsideration of claims 1-3 is therefore respectfully requested.

Objections to the Drawings and Amendments in Prior Response and Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, First paragraph

The Office Action objected to the Drawings because the recited elements of claim 8 are allegedly not depicted. The Office Action further objected to the Response of April 25, 2008 because the amendments to claim 8 allegedly introduced new subject matter. Claim 8 is further rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully urge that each of these grounds for objection/rejection should be withdrawn in view of the present amendments and the following comments.

Applicants respectfully note that the originally filed application, including original claim 8, included disclosure related, for example, to a serving-call session control function (S-CSCF), a central node of the signalling plane. As defined in the applicable technical standards, the S-CSCF is a session initiation protocol (SIP) server that performs session control. Accordingly, certain apparatus disclosed in the present application must include a processor as recited in amended claim 8. Furthermore, even if this limitation is

not expressly disclosed in the present application (not admitted), Applicants urge that the present application as originally filed included sufficient written description to enable a developer in the field of telecommunications to implement an apparatus with a processor as recited in amended claim 8 without undue experimentation. Therefore, the limitations in claim 8, as amended, are fully supported in the originally filed specification in order to sufficiently enable a person of ordinary skill in this field of technology to implement the recited embodiment. Withdrawal of these objections and rejection are therefore respectfully requested. Applicants urge that claim 8 should be reconsidered and allowed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action included the following art-based rejections.

- Claims 1, 8, and 9 were rejected as being obvious in view of an article entitled “Control Servers in the Core Network” (Witzel) and U.S. Patent No. 6,751,204 (Foti).
- Claim 4 was rejected as being obvious in view of Witzel and Foti, further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/015982 (Bell).
- Claim 5 was rejected as being obvious in view of Witzel, Foti, and Bell, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,032,044 (Shannon).
- Claim 6 was rejected as being obvious in view of Witzel, Foti, and Bell, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,940,846 (Frey).
- Claim 10 was rejected as being obvious in view of Witzel and Foti, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,876,632 (Takeda).

As noted above, the Office Action indicated that claim 7 is allowable if rewritten into independent form. Applicants respectively note that independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 7, and claim 7 has been cancelled.

Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-16 and 10 are allowable for at least the reasons provided in the Office Action. Likewise independent claims 8 and 9 are similarly amended to include corresponding limitations from claim 7. Accordingly, claims 8 and 9 and claims 11-13 that depend, respectively, therefrom are also allowable over all of the cited prior art references on similar basis. Likewise, claims 14-15 are also similarly allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-6 and 8-15 are therefore requested.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention. These distinctions are more than sufficient to render the claimed invention unanticipated and unobvious. Furthermore, all formality-based concerns have been addressed. It is therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 1-6 and 8-15 be allowed, and this application be passed to issue.

If, for any reason, the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



David D. Nelson
Registration No. 47,818

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Vienna, Virginia 22182-6212
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

DDN:sjm

Enclosures: RCE
Petition for Extension of Time
Additional Claims Fee Transmittal
Check No. 19883